

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings include replacement sheets of FIG. 1 - FIG. 3D. Sheet 1, which includes FIG. 1, replaces the original sheet including FIG.1. In FIG. 1, reference numerals 60 and 62 were replaced with reference numerals 56 and 58. In addition, the block diagram corresponding to "robot" has been replaced with a block diagram corresponding to "force applying device (robot or manually-operable force applying device)."

Attachment: replacement sheets (FIGS. 1-3D)

Remarks

The various parts of the Office Action (and other matters, if any) are discussed below under appropriate headings.

Amendments to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to for informalities and incompleteness. As is discussed above under the relevant heading, substitute drawing sheets for FIG. 1, FIG. 2 and FIGs. 3A-3D have been included. Sheet 1 (having FIG. 1) includes minor amendments without adding any new subject matter.

The Office Action states that “[t]he drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, *the storage unit, data output device, the display, and the manually operable force-applying device* must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s).” FIG. 1 has been amended to include a representation of a manually operable force-applying device. With respect to the storage unit, data output device and display (as are recited in various dependent claims), it is respectfully submitted that these features are illustrated in FIG. 1 (original and amended). Therefore, the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 and 17 were objected to because of several informalities. The claims have been amended for clarity, thereby rendering moot the objections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claim 15, as amended, recites a device for determining an aperture angle of a joint that includes, *inter alia*, a robot for applying a force in a prescribed direction to the joint and a force measuring device coupled to the robot for measuring the force applied by the robot to the joint, a detection device for detecting positions of components forming the joint and/or positions of structures connected to or to be connected to the joint, and a computational unit configured to receive data from the force measuring device and detection device and configured to ascertain from said data the aperture

angle of the joint for a particular applied force based on detected positions and measured force.

Taylor has not been found to disclose or fairly suggest a computational unit configured to ascertain the aperture angle of a joint for a particular applied force based on detected positions and measured force. While the Office Action points to col. 12, lines 1-64 and col. 20 lines 10-62 of Taylor for a showing of a "computational unit . . . capable of being configured to ascertain from said data the aperture angle of the joint . . .," this portion of Taylor has not been found to make any mention of determining an aperture angle of a joint, let alone the claim 15 recitation of a computational unit configured to ascertain the aperture angle of a joint for a particular applied force based on detected positions and measured force.

Simply because a computer or other computational unit is capable of being programmed or configured a given way, does not mean that a given reference including a computational unit anticipates every claimed computational unit regardless of the claim limitations attached to the particular claimed computational unit.

For at least these reasons, Taylor fails to anticipate claim 15 and claims 13, 14 and 16 dependent therefrom. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 17 recites a device for determining an aperture angle of a joint that includes, *inter alia*, a force applying device, a force measuring device coupled to the force applying device, a detection device for detecting positions of components forming the joint and/or positions of structures connected to or to be connected to the joint, and a computational unit configured to ascertain the aperture angle of the joint based on detected positions in relation to force measured by the force measuring device, whereby the aperture angle of the joint can be ascertained for a particular applied force.

As is discussed above with respect to claim 15, Taylor has not been found to disclose or fairly suggest a computational unit configured to ascertain the aperture angle of the joint based on detected positions in relation to force measured by the force measuring device. In fact, Taylor (including col. 12, lines 1-64 and col. 20 lines 10-62 cited in the Office action) has not been found to make any mention of determining an aperture angle of a joint, let alone the claim 17 recitation of a computational unit configured to ascertain the aperture angle of the joint based on detected positions in relation to force measured by the force measuring device.

For at least these reasons, Taylor fails to anticipate claim 17 and claims 18-24 dependent therefrom. Therefore, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By /Jason A. Worgull/
Jason A. Worgull, Reg. No. 48,044

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

CERTIFICATION OF MAILING/FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL/ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper or item referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being:

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450; or
- ☐ facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. < >) on the date shown below; or
- ☒ submitted on the date shown below using the U.S. Patent Office's Electronic Filing System.

Date: July 25, 2007

/Jason A. Worgull/
Jason A. Worgull

M:\S\CHW\PI\P0181\P0181USA-R04 v2.wpd